Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RONALD F. FIDGE,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

LAKE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT., ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 13-CV-5182 YGR

SECOND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: SANCTIONS AGAINST PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL STANLEY GOFF

TO PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL OF RECORD STANLEY GOFF:

You are **Ordered To Show Cause** why you should not be sanctioned in the amount of \$300.00 for failure to comply with this Court's Order on July 11, 2014. (Dkt. No. 63.)

On July 11, 2014, this Court issued an Order Regarding Motion of Stanley Goff to be relieved as counsel for Plaintiff Ronald F. Fidge. (Dkt. No. 63.) In that Order, the Court noted that Mr. Goff had failed to comply with the Local Civil Rules governing withdrawal of counsel. Accordingly, the Court set a compliance hearing to ensure that Mr. Goff fulfilled his obligations to his client as a predicate for allowing Mr. Goff to withdraw from representing Mr. Fidge. Mr. Goff was ordered to file with the Court (1) a declaration stating that a copy of the instant order had been provided to Mr. Fidge and that Mr. Goff had advised Mr. Fidge of all outstanding dates in this case and (2) and proof of service to show that copies of this order and the governing Case Management

Order were provided to Mr. Fidge. Had Mr. Goff timely filed the required documents, the hearing was to be vacated. Otherwise, Mr. Goff was required to appear in person for the compliance hearing.

Mr. Goff failed to comply with the Court's Order entirely. He neither filed the required documents nor did he appear personally for the hearing. Accordingly, Mr. Goff was Ordered to Show Cause why he should not be sanctioned in the amount of \$200.00 for his failure to comply with this Court's Order. (Dkt. No. 71.)

Mr. Goff timely filed a response to the Order to Show Cause admitting that he had "not [been] thorough in his reading of the [original] order." (Dkt. No. 76.) However, it appears that even as he admits this error, Mr. Goff persists in his inattention to detail. Nowhere in his response did Mr. Goff indicate that he had complied with the requirements of the Order, which conditioned his withdrawal as counsel on his completion of specific, enumerated tasks. (Dkt. No. 63.) Mr. Goff's acknowledgement that he did not carefully read the Court's Order does not suffice. To date, Mr. Goff has provided no statement that he has complied with the Court's original Order.

Accordingly, a hearing on this Order to Show Cause is set for **Friday, August 22, 2014 at 9:01 a.m.**, in the United States District Court, 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, Courtroom 1. Mr. Goff must appear personally. All other parties' appearances are waived.

Mr. Goff shall file his written response to this Second Order to Show Cause no later than Friday, **August 15, 2014** explaining his continued failure to comply with the Court's Order (Dkt. No. 63). Depending upon the nature of the response, the Court may vacate this Order to Show Cause. It Is So Ordered.

Dated: August 7, 2014

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE